

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11131

5-percent decline may turn out to be overoptimistic.

It would be difficult, Mr. President, to overstate the impact of a sagging cattle market on the agricultural economy. Cash receipts from farm marketings of cattle and calves each year are about \$3 billion, as much as the combined total of the six basic crops of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

Mr. President, despite the fact that legislation which would relieve the cattle crisis languishes before the Finance Committee while we debate the civil rights bill, the issue remains a critical one across America.

It is the subject of meetings, discussions, newspaper stories, and editorials throughout the cattle country. In a single day, I noted three editorials in Nebraska papers relating to the worsening situation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record editorials from the Omaha Stockman's Journal, the Lincoln Evening Journal, and the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Stockman's Journal, May 13, 1964]

NEEDED: A MEAT IMPORT LAW

One of the most worrisome aspects of high meat import levels concerns the great volume of "hamburger meat on the hoof" that will have to be sent to market one of these days by our domestic cattle interests. We refer specifically to older cows that cattlemen have held back for one more calf. When they come, of course, meat from these cows will run broadside into the flood of imported meat with which it is competitive, and the resulting price outlook is anything but promising.

A good case can be made for the contention that many of these older cows would not have been held back so long had not meat imports held cow-beef prices to such unattractive levels these past several months, and that the cattle inventory thereby may have topped out some months ago instead of continuing to increase as it has done.

Without imports, in other words, the domestic beef industry might be well on the road to supply adjustment instead of continuing the buildup in numbers. Expressed in other terms, it might be said that meat imports contributed no little to the prolonged expansion of domestic herds and thereby compounded the problems which the overburdened industry now faces. Remember, high-level imports were a new economic factor that was misjudged by almost everyone, including cattlemen. In fact, the U.S. Department of Agriculture itself is only finally admitting that imports do have a price-depressing effect on the market.

Cattlemen's fears are well founded. It seems to us, and the industry's chances of working its way out of an explosive supply situation—without disastrous price levels and without inviting Government in as overseer—are somewhat dimmed by continued high import levels. Widespread drought, of course, could only make the situation worse.

A substantial cutback in imports would not solve all cattlemen's problems, by any means, but there can be no denying that it would help. A cutback might give the industry a fighting chance, which is not asking too much and which is about all it is asking for—reasonable protection.

The stakes are high in the import fight, make no mistake about that. The cattle industry as we have known it is one of the

things that probably is at stake. And, sadly, there are those who would like to see the proud, independent cowman brought to his knees and shuttled into the Government corral along with grain farmers. Those who think this view extreme may be underestimating the "supply managers" holding forth in Washington these days. They mean business, and they show signs of not caring whether they use the front door or the back in gaining their objectives.

The meat import problem will not really be solved, either, until a firm law is on the books, spelling out in detail what can be imported and how much. By law, we mean law passed by Congress and signed by the President, not some administrative ruling by a bureaucrat somewhere. Administrative rulings, even by the President himself, are of necessity arbitrary and subject to change at any time with the tide and flow of events or whim.

Law, on the other hand, is firm and permanent until changed or altered through legislative process in Congress. Law is basic to our system of government; everyone, including the highest officeholder in the land, is subject to it. This is the American way, and it is the way that will afford cattlemen the kind of assurance they need to plan ahead and solve their problems.

Thus cattle interests will not rest easy until there is a reasonable meat import law on the books. Otherwise, they are subject to being sold out at any time. The present dilemma came about largely because the executive branch was delegated vague powers to negotiate away our domestic markets for meat. We need a law and we need it now, so that the cattle industry will know where it stands, know what to expect, and can move ahead under its own steam and under its own guidelines.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal, May 12, 1964]

CATTLE IN APPALACHIA

The entire United States must share the responsibility for helping bolster the poverty-level economy of the 10-State area known as Appalachia—not just as a humanitarian gesture but to ward against the weakening of the Nation through the spread of this economic infection.

It is essential that Federal action be taken to upgrade the economy of this important section of the country—just as special help has been extended in the past to the Great Plains, the Tennessee Valley and other areas.

The Appalachian program demonstrates, however, the hazards involved in providing direct Federal assistance to one particular part of the Nation. For it benefits no one if improvement in one region comes at the expense of other regions.

Included in the Appalachia bill now before the House Public Works Committee is a program to pay up to 80 percent of the cost of improving pasture lands for cattle in that region.

Coming at a time when cattle numbers in the Nation are at an all time peak, when a surplus of beef is driving cattle prices to disastrously low levels, it would be a tragic blunder to subsidize expanded beef production in Appalachia. It would be as damaging to the people of that area as to other sections of the country which are reeling under the depressed cattle market.

There are provisions in the Appalachia bill which are constructive and which deserve the most serious consideration.

Expanded highway development and establishment of health centers, largely at Federal expense, would appear to be helpful without damaging anyone. The proposal for technical assistance and loans to improve timber production has merit in view of serious timber shortages developing in this country.

If land values and labor costs in Appala-

chia are favorable, and if natural factors are suitable, it is likely that an expanded beef industry will develop there without special subsidies. Certainly that area is entitled to the benefits of existing conservation and land use programs that encourage a switch from row crops to grasslands.

But to deliberately build up the cattle business there, in the face of presently existing surpluses all over the country, would be a classic example of the wrong kind of Government intervention.

It can be hoped that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman will recognize the folly of this proposal and use all his influence to scotch the idea before it goes further.

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, May 12, 1964]

IMPORTS AND POLITICS

In a talk in Des Moines Saturday, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman shoved the matter of depressed beef prices further into the political arena than has been done either by farm State Governors or the beef industry men themselves.

He said that Republicans have tried to tell farmers that the only reason for skidding prices was the importation of beef from foreign countries. The record does not bear out such a statement—either from GOP leaders or those in the cattle industry. Their case has been based on the view that imports, plus record domestic output, has had a significant price effect. They have also correctly charged that the key to action in the imports field is in the hands of the administration.

The Freeman attitude, very late admittance that imports were any factor in the market, and then this attempt in Des Moines to inject partisanship into the matter, further obscures an issue which he and his Department, along with the President, have treated as a minor irritant—something to be shooed off the stage while poverty programs occupy the spotlight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments (No. 577) proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to the amendments (No. 513) proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], for himself and other Senators, relating to jury trials in criminal contempt cases.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 243 Leg.]

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Fulbright | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Morton |
| Anderson | Gruening | Moses |
| Bartlett | Hart | Mundt |
| Bayh | Hartke | Nelson |
| Beall | Hayden | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | Pastore |
| Bible | Holland | Pearson |
| Boggs | Humphrey | Pell |
| Burdick | Inouye | Prouty |
| Byrd, Va. | Jackson | Proxmire |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Javits | Randolph |
| Cannon | Jordan, Idaho | Ribicoff |
| Carlson | Keating | Saltonstall |
| Case | Kennedy | Scott |
| Church | Kuchel | Simpson |
| Clark | Long, Mo. | Smathers |
| Cooper | Long, La. | Sparkman |
| Cotton | Mansfield | Symington |
| Curtis | McCarthy | Walters |
| Dirksen | McGovern | Williams, N.J. |
| Dodd | McIntyre | Williams, Del. |
| Dominick | McNamara | Yarborough |
| Douglas | Metcalfe | Young, N. Dak. |
| Ellender | Muller | Young, Ohio |
| Fong | Monroney | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor, and that my remarks will precede or follow his in the RECORD?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. With that understanding, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE APPRAISAL AGENCIES CALLS FOR PASSAGE OF GI BILL BASED ON IRREFUTABLE REASONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, thousands of our servicemen who served this Nation during World War II and the Korean war are now retiring from the Armed Forces. These career servicemen who have served 20 to 30 years in the Armed Forces are facing a very difficult readjustment problem.

Mr. Paul S. Smelser, writing in the Service Letter of the National Association of State Approval Agencies, has reminded us that these career servicemen are for the most part being denied the readjustment benefits of the previous GI bills due to their continued service in the Armed Forces. S. 5, the cold war GI bill, sponsored by 39 Senators, would overcome this unjust situation by providing readjustment assistance to these deserving men and women who have given their valuable and loyal service during the cold war since January 31, 1955. This is one of the many cogent and compelling reasons why the Senate should consider and pass the cold war GI bill, S. 5, which is now on the Senate Calendar, where it has been since the second day of July 1963—the most neglected, shoved aside, stomped on bill in the Senate.

I shall read a few paragraphs from Mr. Smelser's letter, distributed nationwide through the National Association of State Approval Agencies:

They are skilled in military occupational specialties that have little or no relation to civilian occupations. It seems unlikely that they will remain unemployed or be employed in unskilled occupations.

Mr. President, that is the kind of future that awaits the veteran of today, unless Senate bill 5 is passed, so as to give him a real opportunity in life. I continue to read from Mr. Smelser's letter:

It appears that a large portion of their potential production will be wasted.

These men earned the education and training assistance benefits provided by Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress and the similar benefits provided by Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress. But they were unable to take advantage of these opportunities because they continued to serve in the Armed Forces. Now, most of them are not eligible for these benefits unless they were officers.

It has often been overlooked that these deserving veterans will be eligible for education and training assistance benefits when the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act (S. 5) is enacted into law. The educational assistance benefits provided by this law will enable them to increase their earning power and their usefulness as a citizen.

Some veterans organizations have failed to give active support to legislation that would provide educational benefits for cold war veterans. They have maintained that their primary concern is for their own members and that cold war veterans are not eligible for membership in their organizations. By adopting this policy they have failed to act for the benefit of their members who are not only veterans of the cold war but are also veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

We are hopeful that veterans, veterans organizations, and educators will increase their active support of S. 5 and that this bill will be enacted into law in the near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter written by Mr. Smelser, entitled "The World War II-Korean Conflict-Cold War Veteran," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD WAR II-KOREAN CONFLICT-COLD WAR VETERAN

(By Paul S. Smelser)

Thousands of men who first entered the Armed Forces during World War II are now retiring from the services. These men served their country during three critical periods—World War II, the Korean conflict, and the cold war.

Some of these veterans have acquired knowledge and skills that are closely related to a civilian occupation. They can look forward to 15 or 20 or more productive years in the civilian economy. They can expect to adequately support themselves and their dependents and to contribute to the economy and the general welfare of their community and their Nation.

Large numbers of these veterans, however, are discovering that they are poorly-equipped for civilian life. They are skilled in military occupational specialties that have little or no relation to civilian occupations. It seems likely that they will remain unemployed or be employed in unskilled occupations. It appears that a large portion of their potential production will be wasted.

These men earned the education and training assistance benefits provided by Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress and the similar benefits provided by Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress. But they were unable to take advantage of these opportunities because they continued to serve in the Armed Forces. Now, most of them are not eligible for these benefits unless they were officers.

It has often been overlooked that these deserving veterans will be eligible for educa-

tion and training assistance benefits when the cold war veterans' readjustment assistance (S. 5) is enacted into law. The educational assistance benefits provided by this law will enable them to increase their earning power and their usefulness as a citizen.

Some veterans organizations have failed to give active support to legislation that would provide educational benefits for cold war veterans. They have maintained that their primary concern is for their own members and that cold war veterans are not eligible for membership in their organizations. By adopting this policy they have failed to act for the benefit of their members who are not only veterans of the cold war but are also veterans of World War II and The Korean conflict.

We are hopeful that veterans, veterans organizations, and educators will increase their active support of S. 5 and that this bill will be enacted into law in the near future.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, 62 years ago today a small Caribbean island, for which the United States had fought a bloody war with Spain, became the free and independent nation of Cuba. On this date in 1902, the Stars and Stripes were lowered and the Cuban flag—the lone star flag of Narcisco Lopez—was raised on Morro Castel at the entrance of Havana Harbor.

The ceremony was a singular tribute to America's military persuasion and her diplomatic excellence for we had acted in accordance with the mandate of Congress, expressed in the joint resolution of 1898, and made Cuba the "free and independent" nation that she "is and by right should be."

The occasion on which we willingly surrendered the territory we had won in war marked the birth of a sovereign state that was to thrive until its creator scored an opprobrious political first by helping execute that to which it had given life.

With the indulgence of my colleagues, I should like to discuss briefly the rise and the fall of Cuban freedom and the creation in its ashes of a Communist satellite whose power is spreading like a malignancy to infest and feed upon all Latin America.

The circumstances surrounding the fall of Cuba in the closing months of the Eisenhower administration are related in a book, "The Fourth Floor," authored by our former Ambassador to Cuba, Earl E. Smith. Ambassador Smith's tract is a dispassionate, authentic account of how the United States, hiding behind a tapestry of lies and subterfuge called nonintervention in Cuba's internal affairs, disarmed Fulgencio Batista, turned other once friendly nations against him and propelled into the presidential palace in Havana, a man with a voluminous record of Communist activity.

The prelude to the rise of Castro's star is fantastic. Castro was compared to Abraham Lincoln and pictured generally as a composite savior, a Robin Hood, and a friendly family physician by the American press. He was openly aided by the United States against the Government of Cuba with which we had friendly and formal relations.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11133

There was a mad scramble in Washington to become a part of the irreversible tide of history that was to drive the despot Batista out of power and supplant him with the romantic and cavalier Fidel Castro.

As Ambassador Smith relates:

I was told by both President Batista and Prime Minister Guell that the Cuban Government was fighting for its life against terrorists and Communist-inspired revolutionists. Batista added, the Government of Cuba was friendly to the United States and supported the United States wholeheartedly in its fight against communism. He could not understand U.S. intervention on behalf of Castro in his hour of need (p. 99).

This quote is no defense of Batista for he was an ironfisted dictator. However, he would have surrendered office to a constitutionally elected successor had Castro not succeeded in preventing the elections.

The case of Cuba is an open book, written with untold suffering, blood, and deprivation from which any observant reader may learn much. The monster, fed by the United States as a pup in the Sierra Maestra, is now a mature ravenous animal stalking all the Americas and hence, all the free world. Castro has ruled Cuba with an "iron fist" for 5 long years during which he has labored ceaselessly to export revolution. The State Department has hard evidence of such attempts in at least six countries. We were witness a few weeks ago to the superbly documented report by the OAS on Cuban subversion and terrorism in Venezuela. It is somewhat surprising in this context, in view of the tragic history of the past 5 years, to find Cuba referred to as an "old myth" and a "nuisance."

What has happened in Cuba is no myth. What could have happened to the United States in October of 1962 is not a myth. I will quickly admit, however, that there are misconceptions in our foreign policy and in the national consensus regarding communism and Cuba. I should like very briefly to outline what to me are the most patent of these.

The American Government and press seek to give the impression that Castro is some abstract type of rum-soaked idiot whose attitudes fluctuate between total dementia and incidental perversion. But, if the views of those who best understand the nuances of Castro's mind are to be weighed, a fool is precisely what Castro is not.

He is an educated, articulate, and zealous revolutionary. He is capable of sustained, impassionate, and motivational oratory reminiscent of Hitler in the 1930's. James Donovan, who dealt with him at arms length across the bargaining table, considers Castro a hard, intelligent bargainer.

It is reported that Mr. Donovan considers it a toss up as to whether Castro is using Khrushchev or Khrushchev is using Castro. Castro is a threat in and of himself and to contend that he is not is to indulge in a most dangerous self-deception.

I regard as another misconception the postulate that Cuba does not pose a direct threat to the United States albeit

it is a peril to Latin America. This is somewhat like saying that a soldier is less dead because the bullet that killed him was a ricochet. Communism is a patient ideology. Its inevitability doctrine is celebrated not in years but in decades and perpetuity. Communist architects see in Cuba an unprecedented opportunity to spread their ideology throughout the land mass contiguous to their ultimate enemy—the United States.

I hardly need amplify on the extent of the threat should we find ourselves facing a Red tide from Juarez to Cape Horn. In such a perilous position, the question of whether or not Cuba began as a direct military threat to the United States would be totally inconsequential.

Another misconception is that a "thermonuclear holocaust" would be the corollary to any action taken by the United States to extrude communism from Cuba. The Pearl of the Antilles is an ideological beachhead for communism, but it is not necessary for the defense of Eastern Europe or the Communist mainland.

Cuba's primary value to world communism remains that of a springboard for ideas, a way station for Communist thought and dogmas, and a Latin American sanctuary for limited military and unlimited ideological offensives. This does not make Cuba less of a danger to the United States for our security is bound inextricably to the security of all the Americas. It remains, however, that in modern warfare Cuba is unnecessary for actual defense of Mother Russia.

I am firmly convinced, and I think it is axiomatic from a study of communism's reaction to American determination, that Khrushchev will not precipitate a nuclear war over Cuba. He will rave and exhort and rattle his missiles. He might even truncate negotiations for a cultural exchange, but with everything to lose and nothing to gain, he will not trigger a war.

Another belabored misconception is that the limited bee sting jabs at Castro by exiles are not effective. If effectiveness is to be measured by the success of poorly armed youths facing Castro's Soviet trained army on the battlefield, then I concede that the refugees are not effective—in that context.

Realistically, such reasoning disregards the nature of limited warfare and the manner even in which Castro came to power. The embryo of the Fidelista in Cuba was an idea, a mountain, and 12 survivors of an ambush. These 12 burgeoned in numbers and in tactics, branching out from harassment to sabotage to platoon actions and finally to open warfare.

So it can be with the exiles. Individually, their attacks are mere pin pricks, but the sum total of these pin pricks and the action they can galvanize could hemorrhage the giant and destroy him.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to retire the popular misconception that Communist Cuba provides a showcase in which "all may see" the failure of communism.

Cuba may be a showcase of the material inadequacies of a Sovietized nation, and the minuscule segment of Latin America which is allowed to peer inside the island may so regard it. Cuba is, however, a most dramatic showcase of the inability of the United States to match the swiftness of contingencies and marshal a political consensus capable of meeting challenges from Russia—for 20 years our bitterest enemy.

To Latin America, Communist Cuba exists as irrefutable proof that the United States will neither defend its borders nor honor its commitments and rescue its friends.

The Latin American image today is mirrored in the Cuban looking glass. If Cuba, the most prosperous among the small nations of America, in the shadow of the mighty United States could go under as she did, what indeed might the others expect?

We have attempted to isolate Cuba, but is isolation what she deserves? Five years ago Cuba was our ally. The masses of people who were our friends then still reside in Cuba. The forces which govern their destiny have changed, but the people have not. If isolation from the American system is the penalty they must pay for succumbing to communism—with U.S. help—what have other nations to expect if they too slip and fall?

Latin Americans realize that the Communists never fail to support their captive governments even though they be 9,000 miles away, whereas the United States, 90 miles from Cuba, can only retreat in trembling archaic isolationism and plead with the free world to isolate the nation which "is and by right should be free and independent."

Liberation—not isolation—is the course we must chart for Cuba.

Mr. President, we have been a de facto combatant in the inconclusive bloody war in Vietnam for almost half a decade. Now the administration maintains that we will win the war in Vietnam. "Win," however, means victory, and the administration has been known to regard that word with derision and scorn.

Of two things we can be certain: The "ground rules" of Vietnam make total victory in the classic sense utterly unattainable. Just as surely, the lessons of history make anything less than victory totally unthinkable.

In view of this anomaly, I would like to suggest that were we to commit to the Caribbean a fraction of our money and manpower now in Asia, we could ameliorate the situation which poses problems of the most urgent and immediate nature for the United States.

To my knowledge, the Vietcong have no naval installations from which submarines can threaten American shores. The Vietcong are not spewing venom into the Western Hemisphere. They are not threatening our access to the Panama Canal, our space installations on the southern and eastern seaboard, or the elected governments of the Americas. They have no nuclear missiles aimed at the United States. Yet, it is in Vietnam and not in Cuba that the adminis-

11134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20

iration has chosen to commit American lives and prestige to make the ultimate stand against international communism.

Mr. President, if we must provide assistance for an army, should not that assistance be for a Cuban army in exile, an army that could infiltrate the Sierra Maestra, organize the farmers and peasants, and begin an effort for Cuban liberation. Would it not be a sound investment in American men and dollars to train, equip, and support the thousands of Cuban expatriates who roam the earth as men without countries? They are eager and willing to fight, under our rules or theirs, to extirpate the madness which governs Cuba.

Our first obligation is to our own national security, but in attending to our security, does not Cuba present itself as the paramount foreign policy issue facing us?

Mr. President, it should not be forgotten, though it often seems to be, that in the course of the one and three quarters century of its existence, it is only now that the United States faces mortal peril. America has fought two world wars thousands of miles from its shores. It has built up vast interests throughout the globe, but only during the past 3 years has the United States allowed the enemy to creep "surreptitiously"—as President Kennedy declared in October of 1962—to the very doorstep of the American mainland.

Throughout our history, Fortress America has withstood all external challenges, but today we are induced to abrogate the very cardinal principle of our foreign policy—the Monroe Doctrine—and bid the enemy welcome on our doorstep.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this juncture of my remarks to have inserted in the Record a statement provided me by Mr. Juan Lliteras, Chairman of the Committee of Cuba Jurists, which outlines various legal ramifications of our Caribbean commitments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. JUAN LLITERAS

1. Since the year 1776, when the people of 13 small colonies, with a population scarcely in excess of 2,700,000 inhabitants, proclaimed their independence from Great Britain and the determination to become a free nation, it has been an established tradition in America that all peoples have the right to rebel against tyranny; more so when such tyranny is imposed from abroad. The Declaration of Independence of the United States is, therefore, the first in time and significance among the legal arguments which we here present in support of our petition.

2. The corollary right of self-determination, derived from the Declaration of Independence of the United States, was acknowledged by the Pan American Union, since its inception during the latter part of the last century; has been reaffirmed in all important Inter-American pronouncements of later years; and is presently incorporated in the Charter of Bogotá of 1948.

3. The right of nonintervention—especially of nonintervention by extra-continental powers—in the internal affairs of the American nations, likewise affirmed in the charter of Bogotá, originated with the so-called "no-transfer principle," whereby the

peoples of America, at an early date, expressed their determination not to permit an extension of the territorial domain of European powers in America. The Monroe Doctrine of 1823, directed to protect the newly won independence of the young American Republics, was firmly based on this principle. Said Doctrine became one of the cornerstones of Inter-American law after the seventh Pan American Conference of Montevideo, in 1933, and has provided a solid foundation for collective defense, under the compacts of Rio de Janeiro and the charter of Bogotá.

4. The "no-transfer" doctrine was again invoked in the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of June 1940 (Pittman-Bloom), and reiterated as a basic principle of public Inter-American law in the Declaration of Havana, adopted in said city by the foreign ministers of the American Republics during the month of July of the same year. Under the terms of the Declaration of Havana the American States unanimously resolved not to consent to any transfer of American territory among the European powers involved in the war then being fought on that continent.

These pronouncements are of special significance at this time and might well be applied to Cuba, where a transfer of American territory to an extracontinental power has unquestionably occurred as a consequence of the global conflict known as the cold war.

5. The Mutual Security Act of the United States, 1951, authorized the President to assist the citizens of captive nations, within or without their territory in the struggle to restore the independence of said nations. This law, while never so far implemented, remains on the statute books, and could well be considered as contradicting the ill-advised efforts of certain authorities to restrain Cuban patriots from attacking the Castro-Communist regime under the neutrality laws of the United States.

6. The joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of September 26, 1962, formally committed that nation to "work with the OAS and freedom-loving Cubans to restore self-determination to the Cuban people."

This law, unquestionably the most important piece of foreign policy legislation enacted in recent years, has fallen into oblivion. Neither has the Government of the United States acted upon the joint resolution of September 1962, nor have the nations of Latin America sought to invoke said resolution in self-defense, as they well might have done, to repel the repeated aggressions of international communism staged from Cuba.

Nevertheless, the guidelines laid down by the United States in said resolution, as the unquestioned leader of the free world, point perhaps to the only course capable of affording an effective solution to the problem of American security. First, because the source of our common peril is situated in Cuba. Second, the aforesaid resolution contemplates collective action—though not necessarily unanimous action, or even action by a majority of the American States. It imposes, of course, no obligations on those countries which choose not to consider themselves in peril of Communist aggression oblivious of the common danger. Yet, on the other hand, it extends an open invitation to those actually threatened to avail themselves in reciprocal self-defense of the support and resources of the most formidable power in the world.

This distinction is important from the point of view of the internal rules and regulations of the OAS. It is still more important with respect to Cuba, because the joint resolution of September 1962, contemplates the rights of the Cuban people to defend themselves and to receive support within the framework of inter-American collective self-defense. In this sense it may well be

considered an express ratification of another joint resolution, famous in the annals of history—the joint resolution of the Congress of April 1898—which solemnly declared that "Cuba is and by right ought to be free and independent."

It matters not therefore that the voice of Cuba be presently smothered by Communist oppression. Other nations may speak for her, because collective self-defense entitles a nation to act or to demand protection not only for its own defense, but likewise in the interest of any ally threatened or overrun by an aggressor. And the case of Cuba is not one of mere danger of attack. The occupation of Cuba by a foreign enemy is an accomplished fact, and this was so recognized at Punta del Este.

In brief, Excellencies, the matter on hand can be dealt with effectively by simply providing freedom loving Cubans with the moral and material support to which, in the circumstances, they are clearly entitled. If Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, and certain Socialist countries did not hesitate openly to provide arms, bases and a safe haven to the Algerian forces of national liberation, with the tacit consent of the United Nations, what is to stand in the way of the free peoples of America doing as much—and with a better right—for the people of Cuba?

7. It is unquestionably pertinent to invoke in this respect the Mutual Assistance Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, 1947.

The Organ of Consultation of the American States has held five formal meetings and one informal reunion, since the Communist regime came to power in Cuba by deceiving the Cuban people, as the leader of that regime has cynically confessed. These meetings have been almost exclusively concerned with the problem of Cuba, or the dangers arising from the Communist occupation of that island. Starting with the petition of Peru and Colombia in 1961, followed by that of the United States in 1962, and presently, in the case of Venezuela, the American states requesting said meetings have invariably invoked article 6 of the Rio Treaty, which reads as follows:

"If the violability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The problem here submitted to the American states can, therefore, Excellencies, be reduced to a simple question, to wit: Is it right and proper to apply article 6 of the Rio Treaty when invoked by Peru, Colombia, the United States, and Venezuela, is there any reason why said precept should not likewise apply in the interest of the Cuban people?

We put it thus bluntly because, whereas it is true that the OAS has adopted certain resolutions—of doubtful effectiveness—for the purpose of isolating Cuba and avoiding the proliferation of communism in the rest of the American Republics, no measures, as far as we know, have been applied or even considered to defend the people of Cuba against the actual invasion or military occupation by a foreign power; and it is precisely such measures that article 6 of the Rio Treaty quoted above expressly contemplates, and which should have first priority in all cases of aggression, even when not of a military nature.

On the contrary, whenever the organ of consultation has met, emphasis has invariably

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11135

ably been placed on the fact that communist infiltration and subversion of the other members of the system had originated in Cuba; and the American states, under the leadership of the United States, have determined the principal objective of their continental policy to be the isolation of Cuba from the rest of the civilized world.

Everything thus suggests that the general understanding is that Cuba is directly responsible for disturbing the peace of the hemisphere, that that nation should be punished, and that it is proper and just for the Cuban people to suffer the consequences of all international misdemeanors staged from the island.

On the other hand, it has been repeatedly recognized in the Punta del Este resolutions and the several statements made by heads of state of the American Republics, including the words of the late lamented President Kennedy of the United States, that the people of Cuba are a conquered people, under the totalitarian yoke of a foreign power and thus incapable of free action or expression.

This should, and in law no doubt does, exclude the Cuban people from all responsibility in connection with hostile acts directed against the neighboring countries, even if such acts have in fact been staged in Cuba. Hence those who should be accused as aggressors are not the people of Cuba, but the invaders and traitors who, having violated her territory by force, utilize it to assail the sister republics of the hemisphere. This was abundantly proved at the time of the October 1962 crisis, when the American mainland was directly menaced by the emplacement on Cuban soil of nuclear missiles, manned exclusively by Red army troops, with no Cuban participation whatsoever.

There is thus, as we see it, a profound contradiction between the political and military reality in Cuba as acknowledged by the OAS and the attitudes and measures adopted by the American States in connection therewith, considering that the said States have long been and remain today bound to the Cuban people by unimpeachable historical and juridical ties.

What a sense of reason and justice requires on the part of the allies of Cuba, Excellencies, is not the punishment but the defense of the Cuban people. And, if properly understood, that is precisely what article 6 of the Rio Treaty explicitly ordains. All the confusion that we have witnessed, the grave and continued conflicts within the hemisphere, would quickly vanish once responsibility is placed where it rightly belongs and the above mistake is rectified.

Had it not been for the mistaken interpretation of our regional law, we surely would not have heard in this hall the arguments of eminent jurists counseling against all interference in Cuban affairs on the grounds of "self-determination" and "non-intervention," under the assumption that the present Cuban Communist satellite regime represents the Cuban people, instead of the enemies of our country. Nor would sanctions have been requested before as they are at present to castigate an unfortunate and helpless people. Rather would all free men and nations have been expected to move in succor of Cuba, hastening to break her chains.

The enemy of America, gentlemen, is not Cuba but international communism. If we wish to combat that enemy, let the arm raised against it by a free Cuba be upheld, let it be strengthened, let its grip be firm, let the sword that it brandishes in defiance of the banner of the hammer and the sickle rooted on American soil never waver. We dare not allow that arm to falter, because should it ever fall, should providence bring upon us so cruel a destiny, the liberty of America would fall with it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, if there is a single precept that has invariably guided the foreign policy of the United States since the treaty with Great Britain of 1783, that principle has been that the United States would, under no circumstances, allow Cuba to fall under the domination of a foreign power. It is virtually unbelievable that the United States has departed from that principle—that after becoming the greatest military and naval power on earth, it is willing to consent to the occupation of Cuba, not merely by another power, but by the most hostile and dangerous enemy that this Nation has ever had to face. Yet, today nobody will deny that Cuba—which "is and by right should be free and independent"—is nought but a Communist satellite, a perpetual monument to the elasticity of American commitments, and a reminder to every nation in the Western Hemisphere that "you, too, can be stripped of your sovereignty and made a Communist satellite."

Mr. President, the free world has been inspired by reports that exiles have landed or will soon land on the Cuban coast to rebuild the anti-Castro underground. It is most indicative that these reports have produced neither histrionics from the Soviets against the United States nor retaliation by the United States against the exiles.

It is difficult in times of relative peace for a nation to put incidents of war into proper perspective. This is perhaps an explanation for the failure of most Americans to realize the enormity of what has been done to Cuba.

Although only 90 miles from our shores, Cuba's plight is revealed to us through the same media which bring us news of Vietnam and Europe. We tend to view Cuba—after 5 years of Communist domination—in a rather abstract and detached manner.

The memory of man is short. Perhaps it is too short to reach back to October of 1962. There was nothing abstract about Cuba then. We faced a mortal danger. We were cognizant of that danger. Cuba is today as invidious a threat as in the missile crisis, but stripped of the glare of publicity and the easily discernible military potentiality of missiles, the quiet crisis of Cuba has tended to slip from the American conscience.

On this, the 62d anniversary of the creation of the nation for which Americans fought and bled, it is to be hoped that a new national awareness will be forthcoming.

Cuba today can still be freed without direct American military intervention. It can be freed by the exiles and without the serious threat of a thermonuclear war. Time is working against us, however, and there is much to be done.

It is incumbent at this late hour, Mr. President, for the administration to provide assistance and strategic planning for the Cuban exiles who are legitimately entitled to work for the liberation of their country. The United States must not only unshackle the Cubans but also direct their efforts so that the common cause—Cuban independence—can be achieved in the shortest possible time.

The administration should recognize a Cuban Government in exile and seek to have that Government given recognition in the Councils of the Organization of American States. It should be acknowledged that the disunity of the Cubans is having a most deleterious effect on their efforts for independence. It should also be acknowledged that the Government of the United States is promoting such disunity as a means of keeping the Cubans in check. A government in exile could provide the singleness of voice that exiles have lacked throughout Castro's reign.

Mr. President, Public Law 733, passed by the 87th Congress and signed by President Kennedy, commits the United States "to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspiration of the Cuban people for self-determination. This is a law, not merely a resolution. It would seem that in the course of recent history we have as a nation broken the law, as well as the spirit of collective defense envisioned by the Organization of American States and the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

The laws, the treaties, the men and machines, and the vital necessity for liberating Cuba are present. It is only determination by the United States that seems to be inadequate.

I do not advocate that the United States be a participant in direct military action in the Caribbean, but we can act as we are acting in Vietnam. We can equip. We can train. We can arm and advise. We are doing this and more in a land 5,000 miles away for a cause ambiguous and ill-defined. We cannot in conscience, in honor, in compliance with the national will, in deference to our myriad commitments, and for our own security, fail to do at least as much in Cuba.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on what I believe to be a superb speech on an extremely important subject, a subject which all Americans have been wrestling with ever since Castro came to power—and certainly in explicit detail ever since the summer of 1962.

I believe that the programs and the points which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has made—particularly on the need to recognize a government-in-exile, and the amount of time, effort and money being spent in Vietnam compared to Cuba, Vietnam being 5,000 miles away and Cuba only 90 miles away—are important considerations to impinge upon the American conscience and the administration's effort to formulate an adequate policy. I hope it will make some effort to formulate one.

It is a real privilege for me to stand on the floor of the Senate and make a few comments on the same subject.

Mr. President, Cuba, which was granted its independence by the United States on this date in 1902, has gone through many trying and difficult periods. After struggling to maintain their freedom for 50 years, the Cuban people saw their elected government headed by Dr. Carlos Príos give way to the regime

11136

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20

of Major General Batista through a military coup on March 10, 1952. Since then, they have not had an opportunity to determine their own destiny through the elective process.

This is particularly significant for us in the United States, in view of the fact that we have enjoyed three presidential elections, six national legislative elections, and countless state and local elections since that date. It is also of significance because this island nation gained its freedom through the actions of the United States, and has since lost its freedom through the lack of action of the United States.

Today, Cuba is an island of horror, and a mere shell of what existed prior to Castro's takeover.

It is an island fortress, stocked and supplied by one or more foreign and unfriendly powers. Its Government has resorted to mass arrests, executions, and the most heinous of crimes against its own citizens, in order to maintain its position of power over the people.

It is, without any question or doubt whatsoever, a staging area, a training ground, and a jumping off point for Communist subversion and sabotage against the entire Western Hemisphere.

This is not a natural role for the Cuban people. They are not by nature subverters of freedom, or saboteurs of foreign governments. They are freedom-loving, honest, and hard-working people who were tricked into believing that Castro was, in fact, interested in bringing about democratic reforms and civil liberties for all Cubans. They know now, however, that Castro lied. Those who have dared speak out against him have found themselves at best imprisoned, and at worst tortured and murdered.

It is difficult for those of us in this country to imagine the terror and privation being experienced by the Cuban people. We forget, for example, that as recently as 1957, just before the Communists came to power, Cuba was ranked fourth among all Latin American countries in per capita income.

Reports coming out of Cuba today indicate a catastrophic drop from that level. We must also realize that in 1958 Cuba was self-supporting in many foodstuffs, such as meat, poultry, fish, fruits, dairy products, and coffee. Reports from Cuba today indicate that not only has the rationing of foodstuffs become progressively more stringent since the Communists gained control, but a ration card is now only a license to search for food, not a guarantee of getting it.

According to a report issued in May, 1962, by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, entitled "Agriculture and Food Situation in Cuba," prior to Castro the Cuban people were among the best fed people, not only in Latin America but in the entire world. This report further states:

Farm output in the late 1950's was twice the 1935-39 level with an average annual growth of 3.5 percent of the two decades, significantly higher than average population growth of about 2.3 percent for the same period. Furthermore, production for both domestic consumption and export was accelerating just prior to the Castro takeover.

Agrarian reform has disrupted production but has neither fulfilled Government promises nor met needs and expectations of the rural people.

There will be little to celebrate on Cuban soil today, but the courageous Cubans still struggling for freedom will undoubtedly be blowing up more bridges, destroying more factories, and disrupting more Communists' plans, even though they must incur the displeasure of this administration to do it. Their efforts to date have, by and large, been scattered and fairly disorganized, if what we read in the press is accurate, but there are signs of unity developing. We must not belittle their efforts. Rather, we should keep in mind the fact that when Fidel Castro waded ashore in his much heralded invasion of Cuba in November of 1956, he had only 82 men with him. This small band of men, many of whom were captured or killed in the earliest stages of the revolution, now control the nation. Such could eventually be the fate of the present Cubans revolting against the Castro Communist regime.

The U.S. Government has made two grievous errors with respect to Cuba, and appears to be making a third. First, it either had not known of or overlooked Castro's Communist leanings when it gave tacit approval to his anti-Batista revolution. Second, it reneged on what now appears to have been a clear commitment to support, to whatever extent necessary for success, the Bay of Pigs invasion which undoubtedly would have toppled Castro and ended Communist influence in this hemisphere. Now it is committing the gravest mistake of all by doing nothing at all. It is not even making an effort to keep the American people fully informed of the situation so close to our own shores.

There are some highly influential Americans, even in the Senate, who do not seem to view Mr. Castro's actions with alarm, but would instead classify them as mere nuisances. It cannot be a mere nuisance when the largest nation in South America, Brazil, is almost converted into a Communist satellite, and, according to our own State Department, largely through the subversive activities of Cuban trained and supported Communists. Certainly, the new Brazilian Government's breaking off of diplomatic relations with Cuba was a result of more than irritation over a nuisance.

The report of the Investigating committee appointed by the Council of the Organization of American States to look into the charges that Cuba is attempting to foment revolution and overthrow Latin American governments, would also indicate that Castro's Communist regime is more than a nuisance. That report states in part:

The Republic of Venezuela has been the target of a series of actions sponsored and directed by the Government of Cuba, openly intended to subvert Venezuelan institutions and to overthrow the democratic Government of Venezuela through terrorism, sabotage, assault, and guerrilla warfare.

The OAS report goes on to state that—An important element in Cuban intervention in Venezuela was the shipment of arms that was found on the Peninsula of Paraguana in the State of Falcon on November 1, 1963, close to the date of the general elec-

tions. The shipment was made up of arms originating in Cuba that were surreptitiously landed at a solitary spot on the coast, for the purpose of being used in subversive operations to overthrow the constitutional Government of Venezuela.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am well acquainted with the investigatory report written with respect to Venezuela. We have discussed it before, as the Senator knows. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Colorado if he remembers the recommendations and what America has done to implement those recommendations in the report.

Mr. DOMINICK. I remember the recommendations well. One of those recommendations was that we take every means necessary to prevent the export of subversion from Cuba. We have not done a single thing, apparently—and when I say "we," I mean the United States of America—to implement it.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is my understanding. The Senator is making a great contribution to the subject. There is much to be done. There seems to be an apathy on the part of American people that is not understandable to me. I cannot understand why we can stand by and do nothing, and at the same time make no effort to recognize the Cuban government in exile, which has given them the starting point.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wyoming. I feel that in an effort to obtain some meaning in the American conscience as a whole, we will need some leadership on this problem in the American Nation which we have not had to date.

Mr. SIMPSON. I congratulate the Senator on the fine statement he has made. I think the statement the Senator made in 1963 was one of the finest statements made to the American people. I compliment him. I think it ought to be read in every quarter, and especially in the State Department.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the very fine compliment.

These are the statements of a five-nation investigating committee set up by the OAS to find the truth. The nations represented on the investigating committee were Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Uruguay, and the United States. The charges are thoroughly documented in a 112-page report containing photographs, diagrams, maps, and statements from the Venezuelan and Cuban Governments. And, if there is any lingering doubt as to the motives of the Cuban Communists in Latin America, the final two conclusions of this OAS report should eliminate them. They are as follows:

The policy of aggression on the part of the Government of Cuba was confirmed by the discovery on November 4, 1963, by Venezuelan authorities, of a plan of operations, the "Caracas Plan," prepared for the subversive action of the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation. This plan anticipated the use of arms similar in type and numerical proportion to the shipment of the arms mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The objective of the plan was to capture the city of

001080000

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11137

Caracas, to prevent the holding of elections on December 1, 1963, and to seize control of the country.

Consequently, the acts of intervention that have been outlined, and, in particular, the shipment of arms, constitute a policy of aggression on the part of the present Government of Cuba against the territorial integrity, the political sovereignty, and the stability of the democratic institutions of Venezuela.

Thus, Mr. President, we see, through the eyes of the OAS investigating committee, a true picture of the aggressive intents of the Castro government in Cuba.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. At this juncture of the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, I think it appropriate to ask if the Senator does not believe that unless the United States does something to help implement the recommendations in the report, that we stand a good chance of losing good faith with the countries that are signatories to the treaty.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think there is little or no doubt about it. To the degree that the United States recommends inaction, or failing to implement the recommendations, the other countries will feel that we will not support them, and the interest that they have in the recommendations will dissipate.

Mr. SIMPSON. I understand that at the outset the United States was happy to sponsor the committee, and now it seems to have drawn aside from it. I wonder if the Senator will tell us whether the State Department has done anything at all with respect to it.

Mr. DOMINICK. I can tell the Senator from Wyoming that to the best of my knowledge the State Department has not done anything to implement the recommendations of the report. I have had fairly extensive conversations with highly informed sources—I believe that is the technical phrase that the news media use—very recently, as early as today.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator evidently has access to some of the same information to which I have access. I am sure it is reliable and authentic. Certainly it is inspired by patriotic motives.

I addressed myself to this report some time ago on the floor of the Senate; little or no attention seems to be paid by the State Department to the recommendations in the report. It is high time for this problem to be brought to its attention for implementation.

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree with the Senator, as he well knows. The point I am trying to make—and what the Senator has done in this connection is very important—is that despite the efforts that so many of us have made on the floor of the Senate, for some reason which wholly escapes me, there seems to be a great reluctance on the part of the State Department personnel, or policymakers at the present time to take any action with regard to Cuba, even on such a simple thing as recognizing the government-in-exile, as the Senator so cogently suggested in his talk a few minutes ago.

Mr. SIMPSON. It is not understandable to this Senator, either.

Mr. DOMINICK. I quoted from the OAS report. But there are some other things that might be of interest to the Senators and to the public at large. I refer to certain testimony or statements by Ambassador Farland, former Ambassador to Panama, at a recent meeting in Miami, on April 15, 1964.

At that time Mr. Farland, speaking of the Cuban problem, said:

I am vitally concerned about the military buildup, the arms buildup and the electronic apparatus, and I think I can speak for the consensus of many of the Latin American diplomats, when they say they speak of full knowledge that today Latin America is in greater danger than it was in October of 1962 when the missiles were in Cuba, itself, and the reason for this is, and I have seen this, there is presently an apparatus moving in and out of Cuba for the purpose of subversion in their home countries.

Former Ambassador Farland in public testimony said that Latin America today is in greater danger from Cuba than it was in October of 1962.

According to former U.S. Ambassador to Brazil and Peru, William D. Pawley, it is the opinion of those who followed the Cuban problem closely that the missiles in Cuba during the October crisis of 1962 were not all removed. As most Senators know, there has been public testimony from the head of the CIA that at the present time it is impossible for the CIA to say whether all of those missiles were removed.

There is another bit of evidence which I think is pertinent and important. This is from the statement of Mr. Luis Ferre, Puerto Rican industrialist, author, and former member of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives:

I know from absolutely dependable sources that there are 10,000 Cubans right now studying in Czechoslovakia and Russia. Ten thousand young men are studying and being indoctrinated. They are trying to take people from Puerto Rico to indoctrinate them. They are sending people from Latin America into Cuba for indoctrination in Communist subversion.

I noticed in a news release concerning Senator SMATHERS' speech on this subject earlier today, that apparently some infiltrators have moved into Puerto Rico and are at present in our own Puerto Rican mountains. They are opposed to our Government. They are trained and have been infiltrating Puerto Rico from Cuba. And still we do nothing.

We need not even look to such sources to find the true meaning of Cuban communism. We can find that in the very words of the Cuban Communists themselves. For example, according to a recent edition of the weekly report published by the Truth About Cuba Committee, Inc., of 646 SW 12th Avenue, Miami, Fla., Ernesto "Che" Guevara said on March 14, 1964:

When all our comrades understand that each individual means little, that their strength is the collective strength, when they understand clearly that their personal knowledge, their personal ability have no significance.

And so on. This is a far cry from what we believe in this country. It is evident

to all of us that no responsible leader could so discount the importance of the individual in a free society.

There can be no question in anyone's mind over the situation in Cuba.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind over the motives and goals of the Cuban Communist Government.

I think it quite appropriate that on this serious and symbolic commemoration of the 62d Anniversary of Cuban Independence, we consider several questions recently put to the panel members of the Party to People Forum which was sponsored by the Republican Party in Miami, on April 15, 1964. These questions were posed by Dr. Fernando Penabaz, a lecturer and author, and probe right into the very heart of U.S. policy with respect to Communist Cuba. The questions are as follows:

No. 1: "Will the U.S. Government continue to maintain units of its naval and air forces patrolling Cuban waters for the express purpose of protecting Cuba's Communist regime from attacks by Cuban patriots?"

Parenthetically, it seems to me that when someone asks us, as representatives of the people, "Are you going to continue to sell arms and equipment to Cuba and prevent us from regaining control of our island?" we have certainly gone far afield from our original effort of trying to control the exportation of communism from Cuba. I continue to read:

No. 2: "Has the U.S. Government definitely thrown the Monroe Doctrine into its foreign policy trash basket?"

No. 3: "Will the U.S. Government continue to ignore and deny its solemn and legally binding pledges to effectively oppose the establishment of Soviet Russia and other Communist regimes in the Americas as specifically ordered in the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, the Bogota Pacts and other implementing inter-American pacts and covenants; that is, does the United States no longer honor its own treaties when they pertain to the freedom and independence of the Americas?"

Again I emphasize that these are not my questions; they were questions asked by Dr. Fernando Penabaz, a distinguished lecturer, who knows what is taking place.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator agree that probably a fourth valid question could be: Will the United States continue to throw a hot-air blockade around Cuba while selling wheat to Communist Russia for transshipment to Cuba?

Mr. DOMINICK. I fully agree with the Senator from Wyoming. I can only say that that was not one of Dr. Penabaz' questions. He asked some others. His fourth question was:

No. 4: "During the last 3 years the U.S. Government has persistently refused to exert leadership within the Organization of American States and has delegated this leadership to nations such as Mexico and Venezuela, and will this policy continue?"

No. 5, which is a very interesting question—and I call it specifically to the attention of Senators and others who wish

11138

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20

to read it, because I believe it is most important:

Now that the topmost leader of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate has officially admitted that Russian military and political control of 44,000 square miles of Cuban territory is a mere nuisance, will the U.S. Government accept this position regarding the existence in Cuban waters around El Fralle north of Havana Province, between the towns of Jibacoa and Santa Cruz del Norte of the deadly Golem II atomic missile?

The Golem II is designed to be launched from the ocean floor. It has a range of 1,200 nautical miles. It is towed in canisters two or three at a time, and it can be launched by a submarine or by the Cuba-based trawler fleet which now also sails with great impunity 3 miles away from the beaches and shores of the eastern coast of the United States.

The Golem II's are in Cuba now at this moment, and I have a reliable map that is fully substantiated, which I would gladly give to this panel, indicating where those missiles are at this very moment.

The question is: What, if anything, are we doing to determine the accuracy of these charges? And if they are true, or are even impliedly true, what are we doing to protect the security of the United States from attacks by missiles of this kind?

In that connection, on May 18—2 days ago—I placed in the Record, as appears on page 10821, an intelligence report on Cuba, which I had just received, a part of which is worth emphasizing now:

Matanzas Bay is so deep, that the submarines do not have to surface in order to reach the pens, which are provided with a special system of gates controlling the flow of water. The pens are finished, but we do not have, as yet, any evidence of Soviet submarines operating from this base.

The point I wish to make, deviating somewhat from my principal statement, is that these charges are sufficiently serious and have been made in sufficient numbers to raise, once again, not only the question of the security of Latin America and South America, by virtue of the export of subversion, but also the question of the security of the United States itself from a possible premeditated and wholly undiscovered system of bases from which missiles can be launched.

It seems to me that these questions and the information we have received are serious enough to warrant detailed, explicit answers from the administration.

Many concrete and constructive proposals concerning the Cuban situation have been made on the floor of the Senate over the last year, but this administration has chosen to ignore them. The time is coming very quickly when we shall be forced to take more positive action than has heretofore been the case, or else stop talking about the preservation of freedom and liberty.

If this Government is to commit our young men, our national prestige, and our military and economic might to the preservation of liberty in Asia then we can do no less in the Americas.

I join with so many other Senators in urging this administration again to develop a positive policy, inform the

American people of it and move to implement it.

The administration will have my wholehearted support, as I am certain it will have the support of all Members of Congress, in any positive action it undertakes to bring about the preservation and reinstatement of freedom and independence to long-suffering Cubans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] has performed a distinct service by his brief but penetrating analysis of the Cuban question. It is altogether fitting that on the 62d anniversary of Cuban independence, the American people should be reminded of the genesis and status of the Cuban situation.

It was the United States which voluntarily undertook to achieve and maintain Cuban independence from foreign domination. This undertaking was not altogether altruistic, for the relative size and location of Cuba and the United States made Cuban independence of foreign domination second in importance to American security and welfare only to that of the Cubans, themselves.

As a matter of right, Cubans who have been driven from their island homes should be permitted to take any steps they can devise and execute to free Cuba from its yoke of foreign oppression.

As a matter of right, under international law and justice, any nation or nations of the Western Hemisphere are free to assist in the overthrow of the Communist-satellite regime in Cuba.

As a matter of justice and of self-imposed and accepted responsibility, the United States has an obligation to bring its resources and influence to the cause of the expulsion of communism from Cuba and the reestablishment of freedom in Cuba. To obstruct Cuban efforts against Castro, whether or not we judge them to be effective, is to turn our backs on solemn national obligations and revered principles of justice.

More than 62 years ago, the United States accepted responsibility for Cuban independence and freedom. Not only did the United States go to war for this commitment, but in later years we repeatedly sent troops to Cuba, to guarantee that our commitment was kept.

We are now, and for more than 5 years have been, in default of our long-accepted responsibility for Cuban independence. Our reasons for accepting and undertaking this responsibility are more cogent and pertinent today than ever before.

Action to purge ourselves of this default cannot come too soon. All the people of the Western Hemisphere, and, indeed, all the freedom-loving people of the world, will welcome a return by the United States to a policy of responsibility accepted and obligations performed.

Mr. President, in closing, again I commend the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his illuminating and penetrating address on this subject, which is of vital importance to the people of the United States.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

SIMPSON] has just made a very important speech on Cuba. His remarks were followed by remarks by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOMINICK]. As I proceed, I shall discuss phases of both of their speeches. My distinguished colleague has again called attention to the logistics of the situation in Cuba, as he has done on several previous occasions on the floor of the Senate.

Earlier last spring, in a very wonderful speech in the Senate, he called attention to the manner in which communism was being exported to South America, and explained specific means and methods which were being employed.

He has followed up that speech today with another speech which has also given the logistics of the situation in Cuba. Many of us have heard the figures and facts which he has recited to the Senate today. These have been denied by the State Department from time to time, and yet reliable information keeps coming to Senators which completely corroborate the information which he has given to the Senate. Some time the State Department of the United States should start listening to those facts.

I was particularly impressed with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] who said, along the lines of my colleague's speech, that Cuba has relentlessly labored to export revolution. How can we in this country say that Cuba is not a menace and go blithely along, when a country, 90 miles from our shores, is exporting revolution and has at least participated in revolution in six countries of Latin America?

I am particularly struck by the comments which were made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who said on March 25:

The prospects of bringing down the Castro regime by political and economic boycott have never been very good. Even if a general free world boycott were successfully applied against Cuba, it is unlikely that the Russians would refuse to carry the extra financial burden and thereby permit the only Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere to collapse. We are thus compelled to recognize that there is probably no way of bringing down the Castro regime by means of economic pressures unless we are prepared to impose a blockade against nonmilitary shipments from the Soviet Union. Exactly such a policy has been recommended by some of our more reckless politicians, but the preponderance of informed opinion is that a blockade against Soviet shipments of nonmilitary supplies to Cuba would be extravagantly dangerous, carrying the strong possibility of a confrontation that could explode into nuclear war.

Having ruled out military invasion and blockade, and recognizing the failure of the boycott policy, we are compelled to consider the third of the three options open to us with respect to Cuba: the acceptance of the continued existence of the Castro regime as a distasteful nuisance but not an intolerable danger so long as the nations of the hemisphere are prepared to meet their obligations of collective defense under the Rio Treaty.

What I am afraid of, and what I believe every American is afraid of, is that that statement represents the thinking of the State Department. Do we have to

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11139

accept the third of those three options—the continued existence of the Castro regime? I do not believe that we do. We will not have any such thing as “collective security” in this country, nor the thing that was referred to in the speech of the Senator from Arkansas as our being prepared to meet their obligations of collective defense until the United States has the will and the backbone to lead the way to the destruction of Castro.

I continue to read from the same speech by the Senator from Arkansas:

I think that we must abandon the myth that Cuban communism is a transitory menace that is going to collapse or disappear in the immediate future, and face up to two basic realities about Cuba: first, that the Castro regime is not on the verge of collapse and is not likely to be overthrown by any policies which we are now pursuing or can reasonably undertake; and second, that the continued existence of the Castro regime, though inimical to our interests and policies, is not an insuperable obstacle to the attainment of our objectives, unless we make it so by permitting it to poison our politics at home and to divert us from more important tasks in the hemisphere.

Mr. President, is it an insuperable obstacle to the attainment of our objectives if we pay no attention to it? The State Department and the President owe it to the people of our country to tell them what our aims, our objects, and our methods will be with respect to Cuba.

We had a blockade, but we have gone backward from the so-called agreements of 1962. Instead of having strengthened our position, we have gone backward.

A few weeks ago we heard that the Russians were moving all of their troops out of Cuba. The fact is that today Cuba is the most powerful country, militarily, in the Western Hemisphere, except for the United States. Intelligence sources—and good ones—estimate that in Cuba there are at least 150 coastal defense missiles, 12 missile launching torpedo boats, 5 surface-to-air missiles, 100 MIGs, 200 modern radar stations, 75,000 regular troops, and another 200,000 militia and home guardsmen. The Cuban Army is fully equipped with modern Soviet weapons, many of which, by the way, came from Czechoslovakia, including thousands of tanks, field artillery pieces, and antitank weapons.

How much longer can we as a sane and sensible people accept that condition 90 miles from our shore and say that it constitutes no menace to us?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from Colorado remember the elaborate precautions that were taken to protect the life of our President when he was in Florida recently on a political junket? The security agencies of our Government used all the means at their command to protect him against threats upon his life by the Cuban Air Force.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am aware of the accounts that were printed in the newspaper.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from Colorado feel that Castro merely

constitutes a nuisance when we are required to take such precautions as that, or does the State Department feel that there is no great peril which extends to us from this little island which is 90 miles off our shores?

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with my friend from Wyoming. However, I do not wish in any sense to seem to be critical of the precautions which were taken to protect our President.

Mr. SIMPSON. No.

Mr. ALLOTT. Such precautions should be taken. The fact that such extreme precautions had to be taken is indicative of the situation of which the Senator has spoken.

Although a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee placed the number of Soviet troops in Cuba last year at 17,500, there is reason now to believe that the number is much greater than that. I personally believe that it is. We have allowed the initiative that we had grasped in 1962 to slip away from us. We have retired from our position to have on-site inspection by the United Nations of the missiles in Cuba. We finally ended up with an inspection by U-2's, one of which was subsequently shot down.

Our economic embargo on Cuba has been a flop due to the lack of cooperation on the part of our allies. It rankles me to think of how we have protected our allies throughout the whole breadth and scope of this world, and yet, with the billions of dollars and with the lives of the men that we have lost and are losing today—at this very minute in South Vietnam—when a clear and present danger exists within 90 miles of our shore, our allies will not even cooperate to the extent of limiting shipments there and refraining from taking a profit from trading with our enemy. Of those 66 nations of the free world that have vessels involved in the Cuban trade, about 54 of them receive aid from the United States. It is almost incomprehensible that such a situation could exist.

If we wonder why we are unable to coalesce Latin America, if we wonder why we are unable to bring them into a solid group opposing Castro communism, we need only to look at our policy of granting aid to those 54 Nations who are trading with Cuba for the answer. If this country is soft enough and foolish enough to provide them with foreign aid while our friends refuse to cooperate in an economic blockade, how can we expect them to accept our leadership in creating Western Hemisphere unity to expel communism from Cuba and this hemisphere.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think the comments the Senator is making are of real importance, because they point up to one angle of the problem we got into when we started negotiating with the Communist Government of Russia to supply it with certain supplies and equipment, including wheat. After having agreed to supply Russia, how can we say to our allies, “You cannot supply Cuba”, when

we are supporting the head of the monster? I think the points the Senator is making are extremely good and very powerful in this connection.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, because he has taken such a strong interest in this subject for so long, and has brought to the attention of the Senate so many facts. If the State Department had read any of the lengthy discussions that have taken place on the floor of the Senate during this year, not only by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, but many other Senators whom I shall not name at this time, it is peculiar that the State Department has not been able to react.

The point the Senator has made is a good one. As soon as this country entered into the so-called wheat deal with Russia, from that moment on every one of our allies throughout the world has been breaking its back to trade with Communist Cuba. So by taking that step we have helped to precipitated a breakdown of one of the two ways by which we could have destroyed Communist Cuba—an economic blockade or embargo.

Let me make two or three suggestions, although I have no hopes that the State Department will wake up enough or increase its cerebrations enough in the next few months to recognize the situation. The officials of the Department sit and watch the tortoise whiz by. It is about time for someone in the Department to get the idea that events do move and that delay works to the advantage of Castro.

I cannot help reminding my colleagues, although it may be slightly irrelevant, that one of the ways in which we saved our consciences in 1956 for not helping the Hungarian revolution was by saying, “It is so far away that we could not possibly do it.” From a practical sense, that may have been true. It may have been difficult. But those who tremble and cry in fear, as the speech of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas seems to imply—namely, the myth doctrine—are doing this country a great disservice.

I suggest, first, that we recognize a provisional government, as the Senator from Wyoming has again suggested. We have an opportunity to do so on Guantánamo. That suggestion was made by the senior Senator from Colorado this year. We had an opportunity, and still can establish a provisional government, or permit the Cubans to establish a provisional government, right on their own soil—Guantánamo. Some of the best experts in this country say it would not be violating our treaties or understandings with Cuba.

It could have been done when the water was cut off. Instead, we said, “We can haul water in, so really we are not hurt.”

Second, this country should give aid similar to that being given to South Vietnam. We certainly should give aid to Cubans who want to go back and rescue their country from Castro. I see no reason why the U.S. Government should fail to do it.

Free Cubans should be aided in telling the sordid story of Communist Cuba in other Latin American countries. This

11140

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20

would be the most effective countermeasure to Castro propaganda in Latin America.

Through our own leadership, travel between Cuba and other Latin American countries should be stopped, regardless of what steps we must take to stop it. This is a necessary step in preventing further exportation of Castroism in Latin America.

I cannot believe that we have not the nerve, the wealth, the materiel, and everything else necessary, when we have been spending \$50 billion each year on defense for years. I do not see how we can believe that Khrushchev would start a major world conflict over Cuba.

Next, I think we should call a diplomatic conference of the free world nations for the purpose of placing a complete trade embargo on Cuba. Our sacrifices of men and materiel for the protection of our allies has earned us the right to ask for their support in this.

Again, I think we should reconsider, and I think we will reconsider during our deliberations on the foreign aid bill, the cutting off of aid to those countries which will not give us support in such a trade embargo on Cuba.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. At the recent Party to People Forum held at Miami, from which I quoted in my own speech, one of the questions asked from the floor was, "Do you think we ought to recognize a government in exile?" Every single member of the panel said, "Yes. This is one of the first steps we ought to take," as was so eloquently advocated by the Senator in his very fine speech a year ago.

I see present in the Chamber one of our own colleagues who was present at the Party to People Forum, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORROW]. I hope he can give us a little insight as to who was there, what their qualifications are, and what was of concern to those who were asking questions on our Cuban policy. It should be of interest to know that some ambassadors were supporting what the Senator has advocated.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. There was a very interesting meeting at Miami. Former Ambassador Pawley was present. Mr. Farland, former Ambassador to Panama, was present. They were absolutely agreed on the position that the senior Senator from Colorado and other Senators took a year ago, that this action had to be taken.

One sidelight of the Miami meeting which I do not think has come to the fore, and which I think is rather important, is that we sweep the subject of Cuba under the rug. If two young boys climb the wall in Berlin, and one is shot and the other gets away, that event will be headlined in every newspaper in America. That is important, as it should be. Yet 16 people can leave Cuba in a 14-foot boat and get to Florida, 2 of them alive and the rest dead, and, outside the Miami press, no note is taken of it in the newspaper.

The Cuban people are just as interested in preserving their freedom as other people are. Yet we seem to sweep this matter under the rug because Cuba has become to us a nuisance. I believe it is important, whatever we do, to get across to the American people the great heroic efforts being made today by the Cuban people themselves in trying to gain their freedom.

We—Members of the Senate, and the press of the country—are playing it down too much, because it is a nuisance. Therefore, we do not wish to build it up.

I commend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] on what I believe to be a great statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am deeply appreciative of the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, as well as those of my colleague the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

The attempt to sweep Cuba under the rug will never succeed. It will continue to be a thorn in our side until we do something to stop it, because only we can supply the leadership to the other Latin American countries which is necessary to coalesce the determination to sweep communism out of this hemisphere. We can vacillate, we can waver, we can ignore our duty to supply that leadership for as long as we wish, but the problem will not go away.

I hope that this matter will come to the attention of the press, and thus into the minds and consciousness of the American people, because I am satisfied that most Americans are as deeply concerned about this question as any other which faces us in the field of international affairs, if not more so.

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, some young Americans who have contributed something worthwhile have recently visited Washington as winners of State awards in a contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

For 16 years the high schools of the country have been participating in an essay contest based on a realistic community survey under the patronage also of committees of the individual State Governors and the AFL-CIO.

This year the theme was "How Handicapped Workers in My Community Are Proving That Ability Counts."

In the State of Rhode Island the winner in a brilliant field was Miss Catherine Flaherty, a 16-year-old student at Mount Pleasant High School, Providence, whose English teacher is Robert G. MacLean. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Andreas, of 118 Waverly Street, Providence.

A winner of a \$100 savings bond and of the trip to Washington as a guest of the AFL-CIO, she has been hosted here also by the Disabled American Veterans and in the festivities that included their presence at the White House, it has been a personal and official pleasure to welcome Miss Flaherty to the Capitol. As a lasting memorial of this year's contest and as a fruitful thought for all of us, I

ask that the essay by Miss Flaherty be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED WORKERS IN MY COMMUNITY ARE PROVING THAT ABILITY COUNTS

(Written by Catherine Flaherty, 118 Waverly Street, Providence, R.I., age 16, Mount Pleasant High School, Providence, R.I.)

No job requires the use of all the physical, mental, or emotional capacities of human beings. This is a fortunate fact as no man or woman is physically, mentally, and emotionally perfect.

Each of us is fit to do certain jobs, but equally unfit to do others. Occupationally speaking, we are normal workers in relation to the jobs we can successfully perform. We are handicapped workers in relation to the jobs we are physically, mentally, or emotionally unable to handle successfully. In my studies I have come to the conclusion that there is no job which cannot be adequately filled by one or the other so-called handicapped workers. If placed in the proper job, no worker can be justly considered handicapped. Only workers placed in the wrong job, one which does not match their physical, mental, and emotional make-up, are occupationally handicapped. Qualifications rather than disabilities really determine which jobs we are equipped to fill in competition with other workers.

Personnel men know that it is right to perfectly place the right worker in the right job. Yet this type of placement is the goal that personnel directors try to obtain for every "normal" employee and job applicant. This goal is just as possible with respect to the handicapped. Like the rest of us, their particular abilities and limitations differ and make them unfit for certain types of jobs, but fully capable of holding others. If the handicapped did not have the loss of an eye, leg, or other disability, there would be additional jobs that they could do. This is true also with normal workers. If they only had faster reflexes, or mathematical ability, an ounce more of energy, or mechanical as well as intellectual ability, they too would have a wider range of jobs to choose from. There are many things which make a good worker, such as education and experience. After doing some research, I found that most handicapped workers have had a good education and often experience on professional jobs.

The handicapped workers in my community are proving that their defects do not impair their working capacity. There is evidence that handicapped workers, because of their handicaps, actually are more productive workers than the nonhandicapped. They work harder to keep their position there by producing a greater hourly output. They are seldom late or absent, and they are extra careful not to get into an accident, therefore making their accident rate lower. The handicapped are proving their ability through extra effort. They are helping their employer to realize it is the abilities a person has that count and not the disabilities.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the majority leader requested and received consent to have the Senate, when it concluded its business today, recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

I should like to modify that request, and ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until noon tomorrow, Thursday, May 21, 1964.

0000976

501080958